

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are presently pending. In the December 23, 2004 Office Action, the Examiner:

1. Rejected claims 1-8 as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) by Fushie (U.S. Patent No. 6,339,197); and
2. Rejected claim 9-20 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Fushie in view of Stevens (U.S. Patent No. 6,392,356) and further in view of Nakazawa (U.S. Patent No. 6,411,349).

Applicants respectfully traverse.

102(e) Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8 as anticipated by Fushie. Claims 1-8 are not anticipated unless each and every element is taught or suggested by Fushie. Fushie does not teach a “glass substrate having a sealed side surface to be sealed from moisture and an exposed side surface, ... and a first sealing member provided to fill said through-holes...” wherein the sealing member operates to inhibit moisture permeation through the through-holes as recited in independent claim 1. Fushie is directed to a multilayer printed wiring board which allows for increasing density of wiring patterns. Fushie does not teach keeping one side of the multi-layer printed wiring board free from moisture permeation from an exposed side, nor does Fushie suggest that there would be any need to inhibit moisture permeation through the glass substrate. Applicants have amended claim 1 to more clearly and distinctly point out this important aspect of their invention.

With respect to claim 7, Applicants respectfully submit that Fushie does not teach “sealing members [having] a stacked structure of a chromium film and a copper film formed thereon.” Applicants have amended claim 7 to expressly recite that the sealing members also have the stacked structure of chromium film and copper film formed thereon. Fushie only shows that the conductive patterns have a stacked structure of chromium and copper film. See Fushie, elements 5a, 5b, 5c, 35a, 35b, 35c Figures 1-

Page 8

14. Fushie does not teach covering the sealing member with chromium and copper film.

Applicants respectfully submit that Fushie does not teach or suggest each and every element of independent claims 1 and 7. Fushie therefore does not anticipate claims 1 and 7. Accordingly, Claims 2-6 and 8 are also not anticipated by Fushie. Claims 1-8 are therefore allowable.

103(a) Rejection

The Examiner also rejected all of the remaining claims as obvious by combining Fushie with Stevens and Nakazawa. Applicants respectfully submit that the combination does not teach or suggest a "glass substrate having a sealed side surface to be sealed from moisture and an exposed side surface, ... and a first sealing member provided to fill said through-holes..." as recited in independent claims 9 and 15.

As noted above, Fushie does not teach keeping one side of the multi-layer printed wiring board free from moisture permeation from an exposed side. Stevens also does not teach keeping one side of the multi-layer printed wiring board free from moisture permeation from an exposed side. Notably, Stevens teaches covering both sides of the substrate with a front plane and a rear plane, and therefore does not teach an exposed side of the glass substrate. Nakazawa also does not teach keeping one side of the multi-layer printed wiring board free from moisture permeation from an exposed side.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Fushie, Stevens and Nakazawa fails to teach or suggest at least one element in independent claims 9 and 15. Therefore, the Examiner has failed to make a prima facie case of obviousness.

Page 9

Conclusion

In view of the above, Applicants submit that claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all pending rejections and allow claims 1-20.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 11, 2005

By: _____

Enrique Perez

Registration No. 43,853

SONNENSCHNEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

P.O. Box 061080

Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080

(312) 876-8000